

with profit, poverty and favoritism; to the worker all he produces; old-age pensions, sickness and disability insurance, public ownership of all public utilities and natural resources; equal suffrage for all regardless of sex or color; the referendum, initiative and recall. And some more in the same strain.

Which of the three do you like best?—Samuel Kaplan.

CATHOLICS AS CITIZENS.—In answer to F. J. Kelly, *Guardian* sends in some lines taken from Pope Leo's letters that are supposed to cast reflections on Catholics as citizens.

If I remember rightly, Mr. Kelly said that his father had also stated that *The Day Book* was anti-Catholic, while he (Kelly, Jr.) maintained it was not. Now comes the queer part. To whom did Mr. Kelly write to find out? To the pope, bishop or priest? No, but to Mr. Cochran, who very ably explained that he was not anti-Catholic. The point I desire to emphasize is the fact that Mr. Kelly left it to the editor to tell him if it was anti-Catholic, and did not surrender his freedom, without question, because some of his co-religionists have a mistaken idea of this little paper, where all of us ink-slingers may have our say. Which goes to show that we Catholics may have our private opinions about *The Day Book*, anyhow. (If the G. of Ls have allowed us to retain that privilege).

Now for Pope Leo's letters. "On page 93," says our *Guardian*, "Pope Leo writes: 'Union of minds requires complete submission and obedience to the Roman pontiff.'" Remembering that his holiness was referring to matters of faith or morals, I ask, what about it? Is that not a sound doctrine? Each individual cannot possibly have so thorough a knowledge of the bible and scriptures as men who have made theology their life's study. So when they make a law we bow to it the same as when our government settles a dispute be-

tween two states regarding a constitutional clause in the supreme court. The chief justice, with all his associate judges, examines the case, and then pronounces judgment upon it, and this is final, irrevocable and practically infallible. What would follow if we had no such court? Anarchy!

Let no one suppose, however, that when Catholics profess to believe in the infallibility of the pope that they consider him an exhaustive dictionary of revealed truth or an inspired oracle, capable on the moment of determining questions of faith and morals.

The pope, before deciding a case, will call councils, consult bishops and spend perhaps years in investigation. Then when he gives an ex-cathedra (from the chair) judgment, we consider it the word of God through the pope and submit to it. (Obey your prelates and be subject to them.—*Heb. xiii.*, 17.)

"On Duties as Citizens," page 94, continues the *Guardian*, the pope wrote: "What we are bound to believe, and obliged to do, are laid down by the pontiff." *Guardian* tries to make it appear that we are to consult the pope in regard to what laws we are to obey, etc. But let me tell you, *Guardian*, that long before Leo came to the chair of Peter, the founder of our church told us our duties as citizens when he said: "Render unto Caesar what belongs to Caesar." And the church teaches that very same doctrine today. We are taught from childhood to obey the laws of our country, and, as a body, we Catholic Americans are as patriotic and law-abiding as any others. And I thank God we do not try to stir up trouble in our dear land by casting lying slurs on our fellow citizens who happen to follow Christ in a different way than our own.

Lastly, *Guardian* wants to be shown that obedience to the pope makes good citizens. Well, here are a few names of Catholics who held